

MISSOURI STATE PENITENTIARY  
REDEVELOPMENT COMMISSION

MEETING MINUTES

Open Session  
September 28, 2005

The MSP Redevelopment Commission meeting was called to order at 1:00 p.m. Vice Chairman Jim Wunderlich presided over the meeting, due to the absence of Chairman Carr.

The following Commission members were present: Bushmann, Meyer, Schreiber, Wunderlich

The following commission members were absent: Callis, Carr, Mahfood, Peerson, Riddick, Sheehan

The following Facilities Management, Design and Construction staff were present: Director David Mosby, Charlie Brzuchalski and Charlotte Collet

- I. Approve August 24, 2005 Minutes  
Due to lack of quorum, the minutes were not approved.
- II. Presentation from the Gallery - Missouri River Regional Library  
Margaret Conroy, Director of the MRRL introduced the Library's consultants – Mr. Jeff Scherer, Principal Design Architect and Mr. Jack Poling. Mr. Scherer recognized Mr. Keith Miller of Columbia Associates.  
Mr. Scherer stated that they are in the middle of an open design charrette process, where in the public offers their ideas as to how the site should be organized. The first meeting was held on this date in Jefferson City. Mr. Scherer noted six items they will be focusing on: 1) terrain; 2) economics; 3) relationship of Housing Unit #1; 4) extension of landscaping; 5) architectural compatibility with the prison's existing masonry and stone; 6) parking.  
Mr. Scherer presented three different model schemes.

Discussion:

Bushmann: What is the purpose of your public meetings?

Scherer: At the public meeting this morning approximately 30 people formed 3 different teams. Each team took a model and developed a design for that particular scheme. The teams each came up with a set of guiding principals for the next public forum (October 25, 2005). There will be another meeting in November. The pre-schematic design - or conceptual design – will be completed by the end of the year.

Brzuchalski: AS part of your discussion today, have any of the charrette teams discussed materials, form and style?

Scherer: Yes. All 3 teams felt it is important to keep the rock and stone materials

Brzuchalski: Suggested that Mr. Scherer show the Commissioners some examples of various library buildings.

Bushmann: All the designs included a parking lot. Did any include a parking structure?

Scherer: Surface parking only. The reason for this is that the Board wanted to keep the budget within a certain margin. However, there were recommendations this morning that parking be re-evaluated and take at least one-third of the parking to a

lower level (for over-flow, staff and deliveries). There is enough room for 3 levels of parking on the Lafayette side.

Schreiber: Was there any consideration for a walking trail?

Scherer: The Teams felt strongly toward that. However, that will have to be coordinated with the parking areas.

Brzuchalski: Is there anything you need from the Commissioners that would assist you in moving forward in your conceptual designing?

Scherer: If the guiding principals that I mentioned are acceptable and you are comfortable with them we will proceed.

Mr. Scherer indicated he would be willing to revisit the Commission to review their design progress.

Schreiber: Suggested that the lighting capacity and compatibility be closely considered.

After several minutes of discussion concerning parking, Mr. Scherer concluded his presentation.

V. Insurance Coverage Update – Counsel Pamela Henrickson

Ms. Henrickson stated that she and Mr. Brzuchalski made an unsuccessful attempt to schedule a walk-thru of the prison with the MoPERM representative. She did, however, communicate with a commercial insurance broker who thinks the coverage is possible. Estimate: \$10,000. Premises liability is estimated at approx. \$25,000. The broker feels that if the Commission has insurance, and requires the contractor to have insurance, that would make it easier for both to secure the coverage - and at less cost. He also suggested an environmental hazard policy. One million dollars worth of coverage would cost approx. \$15,000. This would require some level of investigation and would exclude known hazard but would over unknown hazards. Ms. Henrickson noted that this may make the property more marketable.

In conclusion Ms. Henrickson suggested that she could write up an RFP to present to 3 different brokers, so that all 3 could then be reviewed by the Commissioners.

VI. Caretaking Update- Director David Mosby

Mr. Mosby stated that no catastrophic incidents have occurred at the site. There are two 8/hr. staff members during the day and one staff member during the evening hours.

VII. Project Status – Charlie Brzuchalski

The master Developer/Selection Process is moving along – slowly. Mr. Brzuchalski reported to the Commissioners that he attended a session with the DNR and EPA staff regarding Brownfield Grants. There is a Brownfield program available that offers a grant to allow an update to the Phase I Environmental Study and potentially Phase II Investigations to be performed. There are 2 available. One is a sub-grant from DNR and another would be directly to the Commission from the EPE. A clarification is forthcoming regarding the EPA's interpretation of whether or not the Commission's status is a state chartered Commission.

MSP Redevelopment Commission  
Open Meeting Minutes 9/28/05  
Page Three

Discussion:

Bushmann: How much money are we talking about?

Brzuchalski: The sub-grant has a limit of \$30,000. I am not certain of the EPA limit. I will verify that amount. It will cover the Phase I and Phase II investigations and possibly some remediation work.

With no further business, a motion to close the Meeting was made by Gene Bushmann and seconded by Bob Meyer.

Those in favor: Bushmann, Schreiber, Meyer, Wunderlich

Opposed: None

Absent: Carr, Callis, Mahfood, Peerson, Riddick, Sheehan

These minutes were approved October 27, 2005